DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 499 SP 036 120

AUTHOR Estabrooke, Marianna; Goldsberry, Lee
TITLE Learning Side by Side.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 59p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teacher Induction; *Clinical Supervision (of Teachers); Elementary Secondary Education; Extended Teacher Education Programs; Higher Education; Practicums; *Practicum Supervision; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; *Supervisory Methods; *Supervisory Training; Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators; Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS *Platform Approach (Education)

ABSTRACT

The first section of this paper describes the strategies that a veteran teacher developed during a study of supervision undertaken while supervising interns in a preservice practicum. These strategies were supported by the practical knowledge gained from 15 years of classroom teaching, study of clinical supervision, knowledge of models of teaching, and the skills of modifying instructional tactics to suit individual learners. The analysis revealed that the purposes for supervision of interns were consistent from intern to intern, but the strategies used to serve those purposes varied according to the intern's characteristics, the requirements of the lesson, the context of the classroom, and the intern's response to the supervisor's efforts. With the steps of platform-based clinical supervision as an organizing framework, the paper describes the pattern of learning that the interns and the novice supervisor experienced. Vignettes of interactions between the supervisor and interns drawn from the documents created during the sequences illustrate the use of strategies and the results for interns as well as the reflection that guided the supervisor's practice. Parallels are drawn to the learning experiences of students, interns, and supervisors as each learned through reflection on experience with the assistance of a more knowledgeable person. The paper concludes with a description of the joy and satisfaction experienced in learning to supervise preservice teachers. The second section of the paper is the program coordinator's commentary on the supervision strategies. (Contains 13 references.) (Author/ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Estabrooke
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

ED 385 499

Learning Side by Side

Marianna Estabrooke

Lee Goldsberry

University of Southern Maine
Gorham, Maine 04038

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco

April 22, 1995

Copyright © 1995 by Schoolworks, Cornish, Maine

SP036120

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This first section of this paper describes the strategies that a veteran teacher developed during a study of supervision undertaken while supervising interns in a preservice practicum. The practices she used were supported by the practical knowledge gained from fifteen years of classroom teaching, by study of clinical supervision, by knowledge of models of teaching, and by the skills of flexing and modifying instructional tactics to suit individual learners. The analysis revealed that the purposes for supervision of interns were consistent from intern to intern, but the strategies used to serve those purposes varied according to the intern's characteristics, the requirements of the lesson, the context of the classroom, and the intern's response to the supervisor's efforts. The modifications were made during the sequence itself.

With the steps of platform based clinical supervision as an organizing framework, the paper describes the pattern of learning that the interns and the novice supervisor experienced. Vignettes of interactions between the supervisor and interns drawn from the documents created during the sequences illustrate the use of strategies and the results for interns as well as the reflection that guided the supervisor's practice. Parallels are drawn to the learning experiences of students, interns, and supervisor as each learned through reflection on experience with the assistance of a more knowledgeable person. The paper concludes with a description of the joy and satisfaction experienced in learning to supervise preservice teachers.

In the second section of the paper, Lee Goldsberry provides commentary on the supervision strategies that were used from his perspective as the program coordinator and from his knowledge of clinical supervision.

On a sunny, March afternoon, an intern prepares a geology lesson for her first and second grade students. As she moves around the room arranging materials for the students' investigations, she explains to her supervisor the purpose for the lesson, what the children will do, and what she expects them to learn. With everything ready, the intern joins the supervisor in the center of the room to wait for the children to return from the playground.

The first and second graders investigate rock formation by constructing bridges with wooden blocks. Carefully, they stack the blocks to support the span marked on the classroom floor. Their actions evidence knowledge of balance, mass, and center of gravity. The formations are impressive, but the children are unable to find words that explain the knowledge that supports their skill. Asking them how it works, the intern attempts to assist them in constructing the concepts displayed by their actions. They look at her, puzzlement on their faces, and think. She waits and listens and records for them their halting explanations. She formulates her next question to extend what they have said. Again, they struggle to frame an answer, but find they haven't the words. She listens to their explanation, looking for evidence that her learning activity has been effective.

After the children leave for the day, the supervisor and the intern sit down to talk. They reconstruct the lesson from the data in the supervisor's notes, identifying strategies the intern used and the children's reactions to them. The intern interprets the data through the lens of her perception of the lesson. She is pleased with the students' performance. Many of the intern's teaching tactics show understanding of effective strategies for teaching. By asking the intern what the students learned, and why, and how she could tell, the supervisor tries to help the intern articulate the knowledge she demonstrated in the lesson. The intern looks at her, puzzled by the questions, and thinks. The supervisor listens and nods; she restates the intern's

answers and probes for clearer articulation. In the intern's responses, she looks for evidence of deeper understanding, evidence that her supervision has been effective.

On a March afternoon, a year later, the supervisor and her professor scan the data she collected during the supervision sequence for effective strategies and concepts about supervision. They share perceptions of the interns' responses to various strategies and the points of practice they represented. They look for patterns and generalizations in the data. What was effective, how do you know, what does it mean, what was the purpose of that strategy for that intern? What does it mean for your future practice of supervision? Confronted by too much information for her present framework of understanding, the novice supervisor looks at him with a puzzled expression on her face. Like the other learners in this story, she struggles to bridge the difference between what she can do and what she can say.

This story illustrates the parallel paths of learning that the interns and I traveled as they learned to teach and I learned to supervise. Each teacher in the story uses superior understanding to help the learner construct knowledge from experience. The intern uses what she knows about rocks and children to lead them to concepts on rock formation. At the same time, she teaches them habits of mind for learning in future lessons. The supervisor uses what she knows about teaching and supervision to deepen the intern's understanding of the connections between her strategies and the learners' progress. At the same time, she teaches the intern habits of mind that will help her continue to learn from future teaching episodes. The professor structures the supervision practice to provide a framework for learning about supervision. At the same time, he teaches the new supervisor a process for learning from analysis of that experience. The path to learning is similar for the children, for the intern, and for the beginning supervisor. Each is engaged in learning with the assistance of a more

knowledgeable person who helps them to articulate and understand what they seem to know.

Context of the Study

During the 1993-1994 school year, I took a sabbatical leave from my job as a sixth grade language arts teacher to pursue graduate study at the University of Southern Maine. The sabbatical year was a long cherished dream, an opportunity to explore teacher education and to find some new directions for the second half of my career. As part of an assistantship that helped finance this dream, I supervised interns in USM's Extended Teacher Education Program. The interns were enrolled in an intensive, year long program which included 30 hours of graduate level course work and a practicum in teaching that included assuming the full responsibilities of a beginning teacher for six weeks. The internship year is the second part of the ETEProgram which combines undergraduate preparation in a subject area, with the internship, and an additional 18 hours of graduate work during the first five years of teaching to earn a Master's Degree in Teaching and Learning. At the successful completion of their internships, participants receive the beginning level of certification for teaching in the State of Maine.

The Fryeburg site of ETEP is located an hour west of the University campus in the White Mountains of Maine. Seven small towns are served by the five elementary schools, one middle school, and an independent secondary school, Fryeburg Academy, that comprise the school system. University faculty and teachers of the system provide instruction on site to interns and other teachers as part of ETEP. Two coordinators, one from the University, one from the Academy, coordinate the program and provide instruction and supervision to the interns. A dormitory at Fryeburg Academy provides office and meeting space for the program and housing for most of the interns. Interns provide dorm supervision and tutoring of Academy students in

exchange for room and board. The rural isolation of the setting and the living arrangements enhance the sense of a learning community in Fryeburg's ETEP site.

I participated as often as I could in the ETEProgram's activities, including team building days, seminars, discussions with interns and mentor teachers, and classes. I stayed in the dorm with the interns on many occasions and ate dinner with them in the dining hall. I attended meetings about the program and, generally, became familiar with the program, the schools, and the participants. As part of a research project, I interviewed some interns, their mentors, and university faculty. Essentially, I made a place for myself in the ETEProgram and became a part of its community.

During the second semester, the interns assumed the responsibilities of a beginning classroom teacher for six weeks in a teaching practicum. They were supervised during this practicum by the two site coordinators and by me. As they learned to teach, I learned to supervise. For me, the experience was filled with the joys of shared discovery, of mutual respect and affection, and of realizing I had something to contribute to others who wanted to teach.

Organization of the Paper

In this paper, I will try to articulate what I learned from practicing supervision so that it can inform my future practice and, perhaps, be of interest to others. In struggling to find the words to explain what I do, I hope the implicit knowledge that guided my actions will become more explicit and available for examination. I will try to answer two questions: What strategies did I use to supervise interns and How did I select those strategies? In an accompanying paper, Lee Goldsberry will comment on the study from his perspective as my teacher and the program coordinator.

The steps of platform based clinical supervision provide the organizational framework for the study and for the paper. For each step of the sequence, I will explain my purposes, strategies, and tactics for using it to supervise the interns, and I will

relate how my own learning progressed using the steps as a conceptual framework for the independent study. I will illustrate my explanation with excerpts from the data I collected. The data are the collection of preconference notes, observation data, post conference notes, and post conference analyses for each sequence of supervision. Other data are the papers and journal reflections that I wrote as part of the independent study. These data tell what strategies I used and the reasoning that guided my supervision practices as I understood them at the time. Excerpts from the reflections I wrote during the practicum are single spaced in this text. How I interpret my recorded thoughts and actions after this second analysis of the data is another part of the story. I will indicate those reflections by bracketing them and by using a smaller size of a different font to visually separate them from the data.

Platform Development

The first step in platform based supervision is writing a platform. A platform is a statement of a practitioner's beliefs about teaching and learning and of the purposes, strategies, and tactics that articulate those beliefs in practice. Each plank of the platform connects beliefs and purposes with the strategies and tactics that will be used to serve them. Once written, the platform serves the teacher as an organizer for choosing instructional models, strategies to promote student learning, and tactics to respond to the context of the specific situation. For the purposes of supervision, the platform provides the intern and supervisor with a clear statement of the purposes the intern is trying to serve and a collection of strategies intended to make the vision a reality in the classroom. In the supervision sequence, the supervisor and intern may turn to the platform to find connections between the observed teaching, the intern's knowledge, and the purposes for teaching that the intern espouses. The platform helps the intern and supervisor use the sequences to build the type of practice the intern believes will be effective.

Using Platforms with Interns

As part of the ETEProgram, the interns wrote their platforms for teaching practice before the practicum began. Through writing their platforms, the interns synthesized the information they had learned in their various classes with their personal beliefs and purposes for teaching to select strategies they could endorse and use in practice. The interns shared their platforms with the coordinators and me through platform conferences. During the conferences, the interns explained their platforms and how they intended to use them.

I wanted to use the interns' platforms to help them develop the practice they envisioned as they began to teach and to develop a grounding in their platforms that would help them to be effective in their future careers. Confronted by the complexity of teaching actual students, many new teachers give up their ideals and develop survival skills to get through the classes. Once used, these self-protective strategies can become permanent parts of the teacher's practice, never reexamined or changed. By connecting the lesson plan to the platform and returning to their purposes for teaching in discussing the observation data, I hoped to help interns continue to ground their practices in their beliefs. Through my experience as a teacher, I knew that the practices teachers use are often questioned by parents, children, and other teachers. Teachers who have a clearly articulated platform of purposes and practices are able to discuss their work in terms of strategies and intended results for students without feeling threatened or defensive. Grounding practice in their platforms will help interns continue to learn from teaching as they become employed and will prepare them to work effectively with other members of the learning community to improve their schools.

One purpose of my platform for supervision was to help interns develop reliance on their platform for guiding their teaching. Having interns connect what I observed in

the lessons with their platforms was a strategy I used in nearly every sequence. In twelve of the eighteen sequences, I asked the interns explicitly for the connection. In three additional ones, I asked questions that interns answered by referring to their platforms. When interns answer questions by referring to their platforms, they are demonstrating that they find those connections without prompting. This is evidence of progress toward my goals of having them ground their practice in their platforms.

Connecting practices with purposes helped interns identify conflicts that were impacting their work. In one sequence, I helped an intern make sense of his students' poor results on a biology test he had given to them. As we sat and surveyed the poor results, we began to work backwards to find the problem.

> I asked Ray what the quiz required students to know. He said it was mostly vocabulary. I remembered that using concepts had a higher priority than vocabulary development in Ray's platform for teaching science, so I asked him about it. He said they needed some vocabulary, but he felt it was all he was teaching sometimes, and they still hadn't learned it. I returned to the platform to help him explain to me what he had taught them and to discover the difference between what he had taught and what the quiz had tested.
> [This spacing indicates an excerpt from data collected during the supervision sequesnces including post analysis.]

In another sequence, I noticed that the models of instruction that the intern had planned to use were learner centered, while the discussion of the lesson in the preconference seemed to indicate a teacher centered approach. I directed the intern to her platform to help me understand the dynamic that was causing frustration of her own goals. I asked her how the lesson illustrated her platform for third grade language arts. She began to explain it to me, and, through her own explanation, she identified conflicts between the strategies she was using to stimulate discussion and the strategies she had used in the lesson to control student behavior.

> The intern and I returned to the question of what is good management and what is too much control in the class to allow for students' active engagement in the learning activities. The observation data provided examples of good questions for students to answer, but no provision for wait time or for several students to

> respond to the same question or discussion between students. I had noticed that the answers were not as meaningful as they could be judging by the level of reflection about the story that was offered spontaneously by children and in journal writing in other parts of the lesson. We speculated about the influence of heavy teacher control on student centered lessons.

The problem was not a simple one and it involved the intern's response to the expectations of the mentor teacher for student behavior, but returning to the platform helped separate the several issues that were causing tension and confusion for learners and for the intern. When I saw the intern a week later, she told me with great enthusiasm that things were going better.

> "After your supervision, I began to relax in the classroom and think about what I wanted to do, not how I was doing. It wasn't just me, Louise [her mentor] noticed it, too. You seemed to expect that I could and would do better and so I stopped worrying so much and got on with doing it!"

[At the time I accepted her remarks as welcome affirmation of the effectiveness of my support in her learning, but now I think the more powerful influence was redirecting her to her own vision of how she would help children to love reading, the vision she had expressed in her platform.] [This type indicates insights discovered when returning to the data after a year]

Another tactic I used that involved platforms was to help the interns view the observation data from a different perspective by focusing at the end of the sequence on their purposes for teaching. Asking them what in the lesson demonstrated their platform for teaching helped to balance the intense focus on a single lesson with a return to their goals for teaching.

Writing a Platform for Supervision

As part of preparing to supervise, I wrote a platform for my supervision of the interns. Like them I tried to express the connections between my purposes and my anticipated practices. I reviewed and synthesized everything I knew about supervision and everything I believed about learning to teach to articulate a coherent plan for

conducting supervision. The platform was grounded in my previous experiences with supervision and in the studying I had done to prepare for this supervision, specifically. At the time that I wrote the platform, I felt my knowledge was inadequate for the task, but reviewing the platform, now, I realize that the remaining questions could not have been answered by more reading, but only through learning from supervising itself.

I realize now that I had some knowledge about supervision before I began the independent study. As a beginning teacher, I had received the typical, perfunctory supervision connected with performance evaluation. In the mid-seventies, I had been trained in observation techniques and had participated in peer observation, again, as a form of performance evaluation. Since 1985, I had been active in developing and then participating in a program within my school district for coaching new teachers. The program included training in effective teaching as presented by Gower and Saphier (1987) and coaching as described by Joyce and Showers (1982, 1985). More recently, I had taken a class in supervision and evaluation as part of my Master's degree program the previous year.

Since supervising interns would require knowledge of clinical supervision, I read Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979), Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1969), Glickman (1981), and others to prepare for the task. I discussed the reading with Professor Goldsberry, and I returned to the books with questions he asked me that I could not answer. He responded to drafts of my platform, encouraging me to think more deeply about the connections between my proposed practices and my purposes for interns. To answer the questions that could not be answered at that point, we designed the study that is the topic of this paper.

My platform for supervision connected the purposes I had for working with the interns with the strategies and tactics I intended to use to serve those purposes. One purpose I had for supervising the interns was to increase the learning that they would

have from their practicum experiences and future teaching careers. Another was to improve the instruction they would provide to learners in their placement classrooms and in the schools where they would teach in the future. I hoped to help them become self-monitoring by learning to make connections between their purposes for learners, the strategies they used, and evidence of their effectiveness. Finally, I wanted my supervision to provide companionship and support to interns as they made the transition from student of teaching to teacher. Briefly, I intended that the supervision I provided would help the interns to improve their effectiveness as teachers by developing productive habits of mind during their teaching practicum.

When I reviewed my platform in light of the assembled data, I found that another purpose was evident in my practice. It was that I wanted to share with the interns the craft knowledge that I had acquired through my own teaching. Before the practicum, I had rejected that purpose as too directive, but through the experience of supervising interns, I learned that I did know things about teaching that would help them be successful. "Telling them how I do it" is still not acceptable to me nor is it a strategy I used, but mining what I considered in planning for instruction and using those criteria to help them plan was effective. As the sequences progressed, I was more comfortable helping the interns develop criteria for planning that reflected their teaching platform as well as my own. Through the rest of this paper, I will try to show the strategies I used in each step of the supervision sequence to serve my purposes and to explain the thinking that guided the selection of those strategies.

Pre Observation Conferences

Preconferences with Interns

The first step of the supervision sequence is the preconference. In this meeting that precedes the observation, the intern and the supervisor plan the up-coming sequence of supervision. I had five goals for preconferences: to check and improve

the lesson plan, to agree on data collection, to connect the intern's purposes for the lesson to results for students, to make agreements about the process of the supervision, and to assure the intern of my support and trustworthiness.

I began every preconference with questions: What will I see? Why do that? What will the students learn? How will you know if they have learned it? What problems do you anticipate? What will you do about those? What do you wonder about that might be shown in this lesson? What feedback do you want me to collect? Do you have any concerns about the observation? What level of participation by me is comfortable for you and your students? When can we get together to discuss the observation? Often the intern answered several questions at once, but I persisted to ask until all of them were answered. I became convinced by my assessment of the early sequences that if interns could not explain what students would learn through the lesson, they were probably not ready to teach it effectively.

That interns varied in their ability to articulate the thinking that supported their lesson planning was not surprising, and I varied my tactics in the preconferences to accommodate these differences. Another type of variation that I did not anticipate led me to learn an important lesson about preconference strategies.

One intern had explained with fluency and in great detail her planning of a language arts unit, complete with statements of what children would learn, what their prior knowledge was, likely problems for individual children, and alternatives for managing the instructional model she was using. A few weeks later, when the same intern discussed a math lesson with me, her answers were halting and incomplete. She was unable to anticipate the problems of the lesson or suggest alternative tactics that she might try. Her description of the lesson was one dimensional.

I wish I could say I picked up on the differences and adjusted to provide more support in planning the math lesson, but I missed the evidence presented to me in the preconference. I ascribed her vagueness to fatigue and the lateness of the hour. During the observation the following day, I realized I had assumed the same depth of understanding for teaching math that I had seen in the language lesson. This assumption had prevented me from listening actively, and as a result I had not met my goal of helping the intern have a more successful lesson through joint attention to planning. In the post conference, I tested this hypothesis, and I learned something that changed my future supervision: an intern may be very strong in one discipline and not very strong in another. In fact, I generalized, an intern may be better prepared for one lesson than another for any number of reasons, and in each preconference, I must start as if for the first time, listening to the intern's explanation of the lesson and modifying my tactics to help the intern based on this lesson's needs.

Establishing the foci for the data collection during the observation is another goal of the preconference. I always began by asking the intern what would be helpful for me to note. Usually, interns selected issues of management: were children participating, were students cheating, were transitions smooth, was momentum interrupted, were certain students on task. I found that their concerns were not often sufficient for the data I could collect.

As a teacher I am used to processing lots of information at once, so I began to add my own questions to the intern's to direct data collection. The questions arose from discussions during the preconferences or from some puzzle of my own. Once when I observed a science teacher giving a test, he asked that I monitor the students' interactions for signs of cheating. I was curious about the match between his teaching and the test he was giving to the

students. Both puzzles became foci for data collection.

Sometimes, I would notice some unanticipated pattern as the lesson progressed that I would want to address in the post conference. Data to support that discussion would also be collected. One day I observed Betsy in a third grade classroom where children were engaged in several different activities. They were to move at their own pace from one activity to the other during the work session. Betsy asked me to map the children's movement from activity to activity as she was concerned that some would waste time between activities. I agreed. As I watched her move among the children interacting with first one than another, I noticed that she used praise more than any other type of comment. I wanted to suggest other ways that might be more effective during the post-conference, so I began writing down the things she said to children. In the few minutes between the observation and conference, I categorized the statements and counted the frequency of the various types of comments. I highlighted those that I thought were more effective. When the conference began, I first addressed the data she had asked me to collect and then moved to what I had noticed. The verbatim records of her interactions with the children helped Betsy to see precisely the effects of her comments. Having the data allowed us to assess which were more helpful comments and plan for extending their use.

When an intern answered all of the questions and time remained in the preconference, I tried to probe further to find some question of practice that could be answered through the teaching itself. Depending on the individual situation, identifying such questions served three different purposes. Finding questions that cannot be answered recognizes the improvisational nature of teaching. Learning to respond within the lesson to the unexpected events of the

classroom is part of learning to teach. For some interns who seemed to be nervous enough, just recognizing that they could not plan for everything that might happen seemed to support them. For one intern who was not concerned enough about what might happen, especially for students who were not participating in his instruction, I continued to question how he would involve them to try to raise his investment in their participation. In a few cases, having a question left open helped the intern learn more from the experience of teaching the lesson.

In one sequence with a high school English intern, simply leaving a question unanswered became the stimulus for her learning. The intern was concerned about the motivation of the students to learn what she was teaching them about research papers. She didn't know if they knew what to do, and she felt she should cover all of the details so that they could have the information, at the same time doubting that they would be attentive to her instruction. The question that we had in mind when the episode began was how can boring but necessary information be provided to students who may misbehave while she tries to teach them. As I watched the lesson, I wrote down the intern's questions and the students' responses verbatim. I noticed a pattern of asking questions and then providing much of the answer herself. Students partial answers were finished by the intern and expanded to fill in more information. The students' answers seemed to reveal that they knew a good bit of what she was teaching them and that they were eager to give examples rather than simply listening. She seemed to adjust her tactics as she noticed that they knew more than she had anticipated. I also recorded what students did while the intern worked with individual students in the second part of the lesson.

At the end of the observation, I left my unanalyzed notes for the intern to

review in the time before the post-conference. When I returned for the conference, she told me that she realized that she had underestimated what her students knew and that showed her that she had not been assessing their prior knowledge because she had a low opinion of it. The data that I had collected for her confirmed the conclusion she had reached as she taught the lesson. I believe that formulating the question in her mind was all that was necessary for the intern to be productively self-evaluating in this instance. When this pattern emerges in the sequence, I feel that the intern has experienced teaching as hypothesis formation and testing, a way to continue to learn while teaching.

The last goal of the preconference was to help interns develop productive habits of mind for planning instruction. Through asking the questions in order each time, I felt that I was teaching them sound strategies for planning future lessons. There are additional questions that I would add if I were doing it now, questions about individual learners and connections to central concepts that I think would lead to even better planning, but, if the interns review the questions of the preconference to monitor their planning, they will be designing sound lessons with every possibility of benefits for learners.

My Preconference for Supervision

Planning the independent study proposal with Professor Goldsberry served the same purposes for my learning that my preconferences did for interns: to check adequacy of the plan, to agree on data collection, to connect the purposes of the study to the effects on learners (the interns), and to make agreements about what role each of us would play in the sequence. I had to answer the same questions I would later ask the interns: What would I do, why would I do that, what data would I collect, what purposes would it serve, how would I monitor my effectiveness, and how would he and I work together to

benefit the interns and to increase my learning from experience. Two questions remained after the study proposal was complete: what strategies would I develop and how would my learning be of value to others. These last two questions remained puzzles throughout the experience, and I continue trying to find a satisfying answer in this paper.

The independent study included reading in literature on supervision, writing my platform for supervision, supervising the interns, collecting data from each sequence, reflecting on the experience through writing, analysis of effectiveness, and synthesis and discussion of learning. The independent study follows the format of platform based clinical supervision that we used with the interns. For me it had some of the same struggles and joys that the interns seemed to experience. Particularly familiar to me is the experience of staring uncomprehendingly at data I myself produced. Like the interns, I found that the structure of the experience was sometimes not enough to lead to understanding. With the vision of someone who could supervise, i.e. see above or in a superior way, I could construct more meaning from the experience.

Data Collection

Collecting Data for Supervision

Once the preconference is concluded, data collection can take place. The observation of the lesson was the usual setting for collection of data. Three purposes guided the data collection I used for supervision of interns. First, I sought data that would provide objective feedback to balance their perceptions of what happened during the lesson. Second, I collected data that would illuminate the effectiveness of strategies the intern had used. Third, I collected data that would help the intern and me to replay the events of the lesson to

stimulate discussion and reflection on what happened when the plans of the preconference were enacted in the classroom.

The strategies I used were dictated by the decisions made during the preconference. The interns' concerns were almost exclusively about management of the learning environment. Of thirty-five requests for feedback from interns, twenty-six involved management concerns such as student participation in the lesson, paying attention, noise level during transitions, and clarity of instructions. These are appropriate concerns for beginning teachers, acknowledgement that having children attend to the learning activities is an essential step in effective lessons.

Some of the other requests for feedback reveal different perspectives on teaching. One intern asked that I find evidence that his explanation was matched to students' levels of understanding. He wanted to check the assumptions he had made in designing the activity. Another asked if I would try to find evidence that the learning activity was helping them to learn about fractions and not confusing them further. These requests seemed to ask for interpretation of the data. I resisted the temptation to simply provide an assessment. Instead, I collected descriptive data that we could interpret during the post-conference.

I chose the data collection strategies with certain criteria in mind. The data should be objective, self-explanatory, and specific. It should capture the essence of the interactions between teacher and students and between students. Data should show the teacher's moves and the students' responses to those moves. Data on the experiences of the class and of individual learners in the class should be recorded. For most observations, I found a script with the teacher's remarks and actions on the left side and the students' responses on

the right side useful. In the middle, I wrote questions that occurred to me as the lesson continued. Occasionally, I used a chart to record the intern's movement around the room, participation patterns, or students' change in activities. I found that the verbatim remarks of teachers and children permitted replaying the lesson. Hearing, again, the responses of students is a powerful way to direct the intern's attention to the learner's experience.

I tailored my data to cues from the preconference about the issues that might be discussed in the post conference. Evidence that was contradictory to the expectations the intern expressed in the preconference was particularly important to record exactly as it appeared. With specific, objective data, the intern and I could look for a variety of connections that might otherwise be obscured. I tried to collect data that related to the questions that the intern had been unable to answer during the preconference, so that they might be answered from the teaching experience. Finally, if any puzzles of teaching and learning had been raised in the preconference, I included data related to them in the collection. I hoped that the richness of the data I collected would help the intern appreciate the complexity of teaching and provide many entry points for discussion of the lesson.

Collecting Data on Supervision

When the interns began the intense portion of their practicum, in which they assumed full teaching responsibilities for a minimum of six weeks, I began my supervision practicum. Over eight weeks, I did eighteen sequences of supervision with twelve interns in placements from kindergarten classrooms to a high school physics class. For each sequence, I collected my notes from the preconference, the observation, the post conference, and the post sequence analysis. Some interns responded to my request for feedback on the

supervision by filling out response sheets about the preconference and post-conference. I included these, too. All of these data I collected in a notebook, organized chronologically, so I could reconstruct my experience for later analysis. When, as often happened, the interns and I talked, later, about a sequence, I entered those comments in a journal. Also in the journal are the reflections and questions regarding supervision that occurred to me and the insights I gained from discussions with the site coordinators. In all I collected more than 300 pages of data.

Vignettes

Choosing a few examples from the eighteen sequences was excruciating. Each vignette was fascinating to me. As I reread the data, I felt again the joy and engagement I had felt as I worked with these earnest and thoughtful preservice teachers. Finally, I selected several examples with different settings, problems, and strategies, relying on the purposes to unify them in the reader's mind. I hope that those I have selected will provide an understanding of the data. Except for editing for length and to explain what may be unfamiliar to readers, the vignettes are taken directly from the documents I created at the time.

Sequence with Phoebe

The first example is of a sequence with an elementary intern, teaching a science lesson to first and second graders in a k-2, multi-age classroom. The lesson was near the conclusion of the unit which Phoebe had planned and taught during her classroom experience.

Preconference: We met for the preconference in the classroom during the children's lunch recess. When I arrived Phoebe was arranging the room for the afternoon session. It was a k-2 class, but the afternoon session included only first and second graders, the kindergartners having gone home at noon. To begin the preconference, I asked Phoebe to explain what she was doing. She said that the children had been

studying rocks and that today's science lesson would be investigations related to the concepts. As she arranged four stations for the lesson, she explained what children would do there. I interrupted from time to time to ask what they would learn. At one station children would shake jars filled with water, sand, small pebbles, and mud and watch them settle. At another, they would use straws to take core samples of clay "rocks" to expose their layered structure. A third table had materials for beginning to grow crystals. Children would put a wick into a medium and leave it to grow over the next several days. The last area had a construction of wooden blocks that resembled a natural bridge formation representing the effects of erosion. Students would experiment with the blocks to see how a rock bridge seemed to defy gravity.

I asked Phoebe to explain what she expected the students to learn. She said that they would understand the concepts of rocks that they had read in a book better from doing the investigations. To help them follow the scientific method, she provided observation sheets with spaces for recording observations from each station. I asked her what I would see, and she explained that she would divide the children to start at the different stations and then let them move at their own pace to the other stations. She and her mentor teacher would help the children at the centers. I asked if I could help too and she said I could. I asked again, what will the children learn, and Phoebe said that they would use the scientific method through making observations, predictions, doing experiments, and forming and answering questions. At the end, the class would reassemble in the center of the room and share what they had discovered by reading their notes. Phoebe planned to use that discussion to monitor how well they understood the concepts. I asked her what previous experience and knowledge the students had with science centers and rocks and she related previous lessons. This lesson was toward the end of the unit. I asked if any students would require help or modifications. She explained that she was having students pair up so that more capable writers could do the writing. I asked her what she wondered about that might focus my observation. She said she would like feedback on her management of the lesson. Particularly, she wondered if her directions were clear and if they were brief. She wanted to have a balance between getting started and having a thorough understanding of what they were doing. Also she asked for feedback on whether she monitored the activities so that every child did each thing during the half hour that she expected the lesson to take. I said I was curious to see if they made the connections between the activities and the geology concepts she was teaching. She was confident that they would.

Observation notes: Phoebe called the children to the center of the room and had them sit down on the carpet to receive the directions. She briefly explained the purpose for the lesson and then moving from station to station showed the children what to do at each one. She asked for questions and answered a few and then assigned them to their beginning places and told them to go ahead (less than five minutes were used). The children were immediately involved in the activities. They were industrious in doing each experiment and marking responses onto their sheets. Phoebe went from station to station assisting individual students and asking questions to help them express the concepts and make connections to prior knowledge. She responded to management issues calmly and positively. Shaking jars of mud is fun! Watching it

settle is boring and takes too long for young children. Phoebe noticed that many were shaking but not waiting to see the settling, so there conclusions that shaking made muddy water were not those that she had hoped. She sat down at the table and helped children to follow the directions. She modified the lesson in progress to better serve the learning goals.

When it was time, Phoebe announced that it was "time to stop and to do your jobs." Children and adults in the room began picking up and putting away materials from the day's activities and straightening the classroom for the day. I was impressed at how businesslike and effective was their clean up! When it was finished, the children assembled in the center of the room again to share their observations from the lesson.

Phoebe asked, "What happened today?" The children reported what they did, and Phoebe wrote down their comments on a clipboard. A few mentioned technical problems with the clay and straws. She asked, "What did you think of those centers?" Students answered, "Fun!" The children gathered their things to go home and waited at the door for the dismissal routines.

Post conference: While the children waited for dismissal I reviewed my notes and wrote a few goals for the post conference: Make connections of activities to learning; review management issues by discussing observation data: directions and involvement; and make connections to platform. I had a question or two of my own. How does the investigation model fit the learning characteristics of first and second graders? How does the multi-age grouping affect the lesson style?

Post conference: Phoebe was pleased with how the lesson had gone, and we began recalling and enjoying, together, moments that I had recorded in my notes. For example, there was an episode when Phoebe skillfully helped Jonas focus his energy so he could wait for the rocks to settle and see the effects of particle size on sedimentation. I asked her to share her thinking during that moment, and she told me she had noticed that he just kept shaking his jar and when it would start to settle he would shake it again. She had taken the jar and held it for Jonas while engaging him in conversation until it settled and she could show him the result. She helped him start recording his results and then left him to finish, which he did. I commended her on helping him to be successful despite his short attention span without negative comments. I asked her how that reflected her platform for teaching young children and she explained that her primary goal was for them to enjoy the lessons and learn how to learn. I asked about the thinking that led her to stop the lesson at one point to clarify directions. We established some criteria for deciding to stop a lesson and generated a few other ways to handle that challenge.

After watching the lesson, I was even more curious about some unanswered questions of the preconference, so at this point I repeated them and pushed Phoebe for more thoughtful answers. The question was how will the activities add to children's knowledge of rocks. The answers I heard first didn't satisfy me because they expressed connections that an adult who knew the concepts of rock formation would discern. I was not convinced that a child without those concepts would gain them from the activities. We returned to the observation data to look for evidence of understanding. We didn't find much that was incontestable. The question led to plans

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for assessing their learning the next day.

Some questions went unanswered and when I was convinced that Phoebe understood them, I was satisfied that they remained puzzles for further exploration. I wondered how writing down what they had observed was useful to such young learners especially since both Phoebe and I had data that indicated that it was an impediment to fluent thinking about the concepts and observations. We had a good discussion of the fit between wanting to use the scientific process of recording observations and the problems of having to write what it is difficult to even say. Phoebe's mentor joined us, then, providing a great opportunity to extend the discussion. I told her briefly what I had observed when I tried to help a couple children to write down what they had learned about block bridges. I had noticed that they could use the knowledge of balance that they had better than they could tell it to me, and much better than they could form sentences to put on the response sheet. Phoebe said she wanted them to record as scientists would do and so they would have things to share when the group discussed the activity, but that it was not a language lesson so it was all right for us to record what they said for them. I asked if students this age depended on their notes in sharing times. I asked if the recording of generalizations during the sharing session would serve as the recording of observation that science demands. We speculated about other ways to have students work like scientists.

Phoebe, her mentor, and I engaged in a discussion of ways of knowing for such young children. I said I wondered how you could tell when they had concepts at a non-verbal level and how the teaching of young children differed from that of older children because of their developmental levels. We had a rich discussion of the styles of young children and the connections of content with other goals for developing learners. I was pleased that I had been able to direct the teacher's and the intern's attention to the experience of learners.

[At the time, I was happy that the sequence had led to the discussion of learners' experiences in the science investigations among the three of us. Connecting practices to learners' experiences is one part of my platform for supervision. When I returned to the sequence a year later, I wondered about other questions that might have been raised. One or two other questions rest in the observation data, and I wonder how I selected the one I did. Perhaps another supervisor would have questioned the accuracy of the science principles demonstrated by the centers. Would that be more important? I wondered how to judge the appropriateness of the choices I made. I wondered if I attended to what I know best, language over science, in selecting topics.]

Sequence with Ray

Ray is a secondary science intern at Fryeburg Academy. He teaches biology and physics. He had had many years of work experience in science before deciding to prepare for teaching. He was respected by the other interns for his problem solving ability and quiet competence in meeting the demands of a busy schedule.

Ray was apologetic that I would see him administer a test and not much else

when he found out I would observe him on Thursday. The scheduling is pretty difficult and tests are part of teaching, so I encouraged him to think of ways that it might prove productive anyway. In the preconference, we discussed the content that would be measured by the test. Having a preconference before observing a test seemed to require different questions, so I asked what type of questions the test contained, why, what items would be difficult, how he thought they would do. I had hoped that we could look at his assessment design, but he told me he was using the chapter test that accompanies the text in deference to the wishes of his mentor. I did have him tell me about his assessment philosophy and what he would do if he had the option of preparing his own test. I tried to explore the purposes of using a text provided test, but Ray was not able to give me reasons of his own or his mentor's. We talked about what students had learned and what Ray had provided for learning activities to promote that learning. He supposed that the test would measure what he had taught.

During the preconference, Ray asked that I watch for things that distract students' attention from the test, presumably making them do less well than they could. I also thought I would be able to judge somewhat the rapport that Ray had with the students and his ability to set expectations for the test situation and make them stick. I should remember next time that I am to observe a test to ask what the students are to do when they finish and what the intern expects to do to make that happen.

The students took the test and worked diligently on it for most of the period. However as they finished they began to chat rather than to do make up work despite Ray's reminders. Only a couple went on to other biology tasks and then after Ray reminded them individually of their late work. He told me that they had long range assignments that they could work on but that he allowed them to decide to use the time there or elsewhere. He felt the chatting was somewhat annoying, but he did not take assertive actions to get it changed to studying biology. One boy appeared to me to be copying from another's test during the first part of the session.

I went to observe another intern after Ray and then returned at the end of the period to do the post-conference with Ray. I found him correcting the last few tests and feeling glum about the results. There were no A's, several B's, some C's and many D's with a couple F's. He was concerned that their poor performance reflected badly on his teaching effectiveness. He said he didn't believe in scaling but that adding fifteen points to each grade would produce a few A's and no scores over 100. We talked about the validity of scaling such a test, the messages it held about assessment, the possible attitudes it might foster. He did not want to do that, but the grades were clearly unacceptable to him. Ray didn't seem to be able to focus on other reasons for the test performance other than his own shortcomings as a teacher. I said I knew it was discouraging when they did poorly when you thought them to be well prepared, and I commended him for considering that he had not been effective, but also urged him to consider other possibilities before accepting that as reality. I asked him what else may have caused the poor results. He looked at me blankly and miserably returned to the last paper to grade. I waited. I asked to look at a test. He handed me one.

I looked at the questions. I wondered how I could help him with my limited knowledge of biology (limited is a generous description for my knowledge), and I tried

to remember what he had told me in the preconference about his learning activities. I asked him to explain to me in more detail what he had taught about sponges. I prompted him with a few things I remembered from the preconference and got him to expand, rather reluctantly, on those. As he did, I looked at the test and asked where students had had an opportunity on it to show what they knew about the things he had taught. We found that some were there, but some were not. This was like pulling teeth.

During our discussion I found several skills and concepts that Ray had designed activities to promote that were not included in the test. I listed these on a piece of paper. I asked him to rate for me the importance of the concepts on my list and how much of what he had done focused on those concepts. As he discussed his teaching, I made notes on the list of what he said. [I think this is an interesting example of creating data during the post-conference. I did not think of analyzing the test items until faced with the bad results. In order to engage Ray in discussion I felt I needed some data to look at, so I had him help me create it. This was an attempt to get him more engaged in solving the problem.]

I suggested that Ray prepare a supplemental assessment to measure the students' learning of the concepts on the list. He could give it the next day and combine the results to get a fuller picture of the learning they had done through all of the unit of study on sponges. I felt it was a brilliant idea. Ray considered it as I explained how it seemed to be unfair to grade the kids solely on a test that he and I agreed did not adequately cover what they had been taught. Ray was silent for a few minutes (I flattered myself that he was considering my plan) and I waited. He agreed that it would be more appropriate than scaling the scores or using them as the sole measure of the learning for his unit. I encouraged him to develop a few questions that he might use. For example, one thing he did was to have a lab where students compared natural to synthetic sponges. They had to use observation skills to come up with differences in structure. I suggested he ask them to tell how the two were different. He said they'd just say one is natural and one is manmade. I suggested he ask for more than one difference. He said he might be able to do that. I felt at this point that I was doing all of the work to solve this problem and that he should be more active, so I asked him to generate more questions. This was slow, and it tested my ability to probe without leading the answers. He did come up with a few questions that would be valid opportunities to show understanding from the lessons he had taught. I urged him to try it and said it seemed like a good experiment if nothing else.

I tried to offer reassurance that this was a problem that was connected to being in a position of having limited control of the assessment strategies. Ray was not ready to let himself off the hook, and I felt it had been sufficiently addressed, so I turned to the feedback I had collected during the observation.

Ray seemed overwhelmed by the work he was doing. We had talked a little about the vocabulary of biology and that it was necessary to have it in order to do well on the test, but that it was not something that Ray supported in his platform. I asked if too little time on developing vocabulary may have been a problem for students taking the test. He showed me all of the vocabulary work he had them do and, in passing, he said he didn't think it helped much, and it gave him a lot of correcting to do, wasted

time if they weren't learning the vocabulary anyway. So I decided to explore the vocabulary learning activities he was using. Since this was something that had to be done for every chapter, it seemed important to have effective and efficient ways of doing it. Ray told me what he had done for vocabulary work. I asked him what parts of the work he thought contributed most to student learning, and he was not able to tell me. So I pretended to be a learner and went through the interactions that it would take for me to do his assignment and told him where I thought I would learn the words. He told me what he wished I would do to complete the assignment. I agreed that would help me to learn it better, but he admitted that the assignment didn't make me do it that way. I suggested that we try to design a better way to do the vocabulary with several criteria in mind. First, it should be more effective in promoting learning; second, it should be less labor intensive for Ray; and third, it should reinforce some of his management objectives. We came up with a plan to have students do fewer words--about ten each--as the first step of the assignment. They would come to class with ten words for which they had found the context and the meaning with an original sentence that showed an understanding of that meaning. In class, those who were finished to that point would work in small groups to make up a complete assignment that provided information for all 40 words on the list. Ray would collect one paper from each group, check it, and copy it for all of the people in that group to study. If a student's work was not done by the assigned day, he could not work with a group. I had Ray articulate for me the learning principles at work in the lesson design that would make learning more likely for students. He seemed to like the idea and I hope he will try it.

I was pleased that I was able to spot in the preconference what the likely pit falls of the test were going to be as far as Ray's teaching was concerned. I hope that having my help opened up other ideas about the reason for it without taking the responsibility away from him. In fact I made it more his responsibility to have an assessment that fit his teaching rather than simply saying he couldn't control the test and being bummed about the results. I hope he felt supported but challenged to think more deeply.

Weeks later I learned that Ray had used the additional assessment strategy to get a more accurate measure of his students' learning about sponges.

[When I reviewed this sequence that evening, I was happy that I had helped Ray solve some problems of practice. I was satisfied that I had made him take action to correct a mistake and learn from his practice. But when I looked at it again, after a year had passed, I saw different features in the sequence that make me reassess my strategies. Originally, I felt that I had monitored my response to Ray's disappointment over the science tests, so that I balanced my empathy for his disappointment with challenge to address the problem. I felt that we had developed a sound strategy for completing the assessment of student learning. At one point, I said (rather smugly), "I felt I was doing all the work, so I asked him to generate more questions. It was slow, and it tested my ability to probe without leading the answers." Ray gave me little feedback during the discussion. I didn't know if he would use the idea or not. I think now that his response caused me to go looking for other problems I could help him solve. I question now whether I was as effective as I thought or if he was more effective in his strategies of getting help by rejecting it, a behavior I would not like my supervision to reinforce.]

Sequence with Maryellen

Maryellen taught a traditionally structured kindergarten class with one group in the morning and a second one in the afternoon. She had assumed the duties of the classroom during her practicum and would continue after that as a substitute for the teacher who was on maternity leave. Visiting kindergarten was an amazing experience in itself. It took me a while to feel comfortable in this room full of tiny people and furniture. I felt like a giant among them, but they looked at me like I was normal sized, so I got over my awkward feelings. Because of scheduling problems I cannot recall, the post-conference was to take place a week after the observation. I had done some analysis of the data immediately after the observation, so I had goals established, but I wondered if we could recapture the lesson. We met in the kitchen of the dorm for the post-conference. Maryellen was waiting for brownies to finish baking, and the aroma kept drawing other interns to the kitchen. If the sequence had come earlier in my practice, I would have wanted a more private setting, but I had become more focused on the purposes rather than the setting by this point, and it didn't concern me. Actually, it was a very comfortable, rambling session, and the brownies were delicious!

It had been a week from the observation to the post-conference, so Maryellen and I began by reviewing my notes from the preconference and then the notes from the observations I had done. I had visited the morning class and then later the same day her afternoon session of kindergarten. We shared some of the fun of being with these very young learners as a way of getting started.

I had done some planning for the post-conference immediately after my visit, so I knew what I wanted to discuss but I needed to refresh my memory by reviewing the notes. Sharing it with Maryellen line by line helped us both reconnect with the sequence purposes and data. Life is so busy for both of us right now, a week ago seems far away, but we both were able to get back to the observation and supplement from memory pieces of dialogue that were missing in my notes.

As we went through the data I asked Maryellen to help me remember more about incidents that I wanted to reinforce or examine. This seemed to work well as several items that I wanted to comment on were things that she noticed and asked about too. We discussed the purposes of the calendar activity that began each session. In this part of the morning routine, one student each day led the class in saluting the flag, putting stickers on the calendar and adding a straw to bundles of

straws representing the number of days school had been in session since September. Maryellen had told me during the preconference that she thought these calendar activities were only a tradition and that they seemed useless to her. We talked about what the purposes might be and she came up with a few but they were clearly not part of her platform. We talked about if it were her own class, what kind of routines she would employ and what the purposes of those would be.

At the very end of our discussion, I said to her, "What is the purpose of kindergarten anyway?" She articulated about a dozen purposes for kindergarten very quickly and confidently. I asked her what I had seen in the observation she could connect for me. Then she discovered purposes for the calendar, counting, and flag salute routines. Once she had articulated them, she could see what else she might do to meet those needs and get away from some of the negative things she had mentioned. It took us a long time to get there, but this was an important insight.

By the end of the conference, it was 10:20 PM. Both of us were tired and I felt we had wandered perhaps too far from the plan. I asked Maryellen if she was clear about what I thought about the observation. She repeated to me all of the things I had meant for her to learn in the post-conference. That was gratifying. But what I had actually meant was did she know how I felt about the teaching I saw. She said she thought I enjoyed my visit. So I told her that I thought the teaching I saw was good. That she was doing well.

Having Maryellen tell me what I had hoped she would learn from the sequence was reassuring especially because of the lateness of the hour, my preoccupation with other concerns, and the time between the observation and the conference. I had felt rambling and unfocused, but she heard what I had to say clearly so that was good. I wonder if I am being too directive or not directive enough in supervision. I think asking the intern to review the major points of the observation is a good technique. It gives me some assessment of my effectiveness, allows me to correct any misunderstandings, reinforces the key points in the intern's mind, and sometimes leads to next steps. It reminds me of good teaching practices that I have suggested to other interns last week in the lessons I observed. Ask the learner to explain his thinking as a way of encouraging thinking and assessing it. Hmmm.

During the evening, Emily and Betsy [two interns I had supervised the week before] both stopped by to tell me things they had done as a result of our discussions last week. I was delighted, both that they would mention it to me and that they clearly remembered the key points of the supervision. Betsy said she was asking a lot more questions. Emily said she had tried the new math review routine and that the kids had liked it, and it was an improvement. She said she only was able to use it once because of schedule disruptions but that she would remember it when she has her own class.

I think asking the intern to review the major points of the observation is a good technique. It gives me some assessment of my effectiveness, allows me to correct any misunderstandings, reinforces the key points in the intern's mind, and sometimes leads to next steps. It reminds me of good teaching practices that I have suggested to Lin, Rene, and Mary last week in the lessons I observed. Ask the learner to explain his thinking as a way of increasing understanding and assessing it.

Sequence with Betsy

I observed Betsy in a third grade class at New Suncook School. It was a very pleasant visit. The children in some classes put on a wonderful musical which we attended before the observation. It was such fun to be among little children in school. It made me think that I would like to work in elementary school again.

In the preconference, Betsy told me I would be seeing the students engaged in several language activities. They had several possible activities and they were responsible for using their time to accomplish assignments. She asked me to help monitor whether they used their time well or fooled around. Two children in particular were concerns. She also wondered if she spent too much time with some, ignoring others.

During the observation, I recorded Betsy's movement from student to student with a chart of the room and recorded what each of the two identified children were doing every five minutes. As I watched, I noticed that Betsy customarily interacted with the students as they worked by stopping at their desks and making some positive and general remark about the work they were doing. Once in a while she would ask a question, but most interactions involved praise. I decided that this was something I would like to address, so I began to record her comments on the chart. I also noted how often the child responded to her comment and what the responses were.

In the post-conference, we began with the concerns Betsy had mentioned in the preobservation conference first. None of those were very productive for deep discussion, so we dealt with them briefly. I tried to use those as ways to establish the patterns of the conference that I wished to use: raising the question, looking at data that applies, analyzing the data from her perspective and probing to reveal more insights, and then making an assessment of the strategies and their effectiveness in the setting, and planning for application to other times. We did that with each of the three items decided on in the preconference. I affirmed that I found no major problems in those areas. Betsy was pleased.

I then turned to the interactions between Betsy and the children during the work time. I had noticed that she tended to begin each one with praise. I wrote down each beginning sentence and then noted whether it was praise, directions of what to do next, or questioning for understanding of student thinking. The tally of the three types of interaction was clearly over weighted with the first and second types. I helped her review what she already knows about asking for explanation and the effects it has on the learner by having her explain it to me. I role played it with her a little and then asked her to tell me how her thinking changed when I approached her the two ways. She could tell me that and so then I had her practice what she might say to the children to the same effect. We practiced a few based on the ones I had copied down to reinforce her effective interactions and to come up with replacements for some of the general praise ones. I think that I did this skillfully. I am pleased that most times I can think about all of these things at once. It surprises and pleases me. I love doing this!

These data contain what I did and what the interns did, and the thinking that

directed my choices to the extent that I was aware of it at the time. They also contain my assessment of effectiveness and statements of my ideas about supervision. They are a sample of the three hundred and more pages collected. I hope they illustrate the quality of the experience.

Analysis of the Data

Once the observation ends and the data has been collected, plans for the post-conference can be made. Clarifying the goals for the post-conference, finding evidence in the data to support discussion, prioritizing the goals, and planning teaching strategies to use in the post-conference are the purposes of this step. I had anticipated that I would want time between the observation and the conference to study my data and plan for the post observation conference. I intended to use the time to be sure I had clear and appropriate purposes for the conference and to process my thinking so that I would be able to question rather than just tell the intern what I saw and what I thought. I wanted to encourage self-evaluation and reflection, and I felt that I would need to carefully plan how to do this in each situation.

I found that this was not necessary, after all. The thinking I had done in preparing my platform and in reflecting on what I knew about teaching and supervision seem to have been adequate to allow me to take only a few minutes (usually at the end of the observation) to organize my thoughts and set purposes for the post-conference. I found that I could keep many lines of thinking going in my head as I took down the observation data so that it was analyzed by the end of the observation. A few notes in the middle of the page of script or a few comments and questions in the margins became my customary method of preparing for the conference, and I found it to be adequate.

The preconference time became more important to me in preparing for the post-conference than the analysis time I had planned to use. By the end of most

preconferences, I knew what I would want to discuss in the conference. If something else became the focus because of unexpected developments in the lesson, that data was at hand in the notes. This part was just easier than I anticipated.

Analysis of Study Data

Analyzing the data on my supervision has been an entirely different matter. Finding patterns and drawing conclusions has taken me many hours. The more I have studied the data, the more overwhelming it has become. Struggling to articulate the findings and conclusions of the study provided me with a hint of how difficult it would be for interns to make sense of the data I provided for them without my help. In both cases, the value of having a supervisor help with the analysis is evident. This part was just harder than I anticipated!

The Post-Conference

The intern and supervisor meet soon after the observation for a post-conference to discuss the observation. It is in the post-conference that most of the teaching of the sequence takes place. With the personal investment of the learner, attention to immediately relevant topics, and the total attention of the supervisor on this intern as an emerging teacher, the post-conference is a wonderful teaching environment.

After the question and answer structure of the preconference and the performer and critical observer orientation of the data collection step, the intern and I met together in the post-conference for shared inquiry into the practice of teaching. Sometimes the post-conferences occurred immediately following the observation. In other cases, they took place after school ended for the day, or in the evening, or, on a couple of occasions, several days after the observation. Sometimes the intern and I would be joined by the mentor teacher for part of the post-conference. I developed different strategies for using the data depending

on the circumstances of the conference. I found that conferences were productive in many locations as long as time was sufficient and trust in the goodwill of participants had been established.

My purposes for post-conferences were to identify and extend the intern's effective strategies; to strengthen connections between purposes, strategies, and results for learners; to plan for future lessons; and to develop habits of mind that would be productive for learning from future experience. I will discuss a few that I found to be helpful and that seem to provide examples of how I modified my tactics by responding to cues from the interns. I will discuss these strategies: replaying the lesson, questioning, modeling recommended practices, assessing effectiveness by results for learners, and using the understandings developed in the sequence to plan future lessons.

Replaying the lesson through the data: Like all learners, the interns were fascinated by their own performances. I began most post-conferences by reviewing the data that the intern had asked me to collect during the observation. With the script or other notes before us, the intern would begin to tell what had happened in the lesson that was reflected in my data. Often we would share the satisfaction of a successful lesson. The interns explained what they had been thinking at the time to help me make more sense of what I had recorded. It was a very natural way to begin, combining provision of companionship, sharing perceptions, and finding effective strategies and missed opportunities for later discussion. By beginning with the intern's concerns, I supported his/her ownership of the lesson, reinforced successful practices, and established patterns for dealing with the data. Through questioning, listening, and probing, I would follow the intern's retelling of the teaching episode from his/her perspective. By listening to his or her

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

interpretation of the data, I could begin to see how the intern viewed the lesson and find likely points of entry for meeting my objectives for the post-conference.

In the example of Ray's biology test, asking what had caused the poor grades showed me that Ray was taking his actions to task. Had his answer been that the students had not studied or were not smart enough or the test was inadequate, the rest of the conference would have taken a different tact. Knowing from the start what his perspective was allowed me to adapt my tactics to his present understanding of the situation. In the example of Emily and her kindergarten class, having her explain the data to me resulted in her interpreting student behaviors to me. Her perspective was immediately evident in her retelling, and I could adjust the progress of the conference to capitalize on the contrast between her perspective of what was happening and the evidence in the data. In the case of the high school English intern, simply providing the data and an opportunity to explain it was enough to help her articulate something she had known but had forgotten to apply in the planning of her research skills review. Interns varied in their ability to articulate their understanding of what had happened in the lesson, but I found that ascertaining their current interpretation helped me to be effective in helping them understand more.

Establishing a cooperative approach to the conference was an initial goal for the post-conference that served a number of my purposes. In these examples, listening and waiting for the interns' explanation helped them to articulate their knowledge. Beginning with this strategy built trust that I would listen and that their interpretation of the lesson would be an entry point for the discussion. It also allowed me to take a leading role later in the conference without dominating. By engaging the intern in reviewing the data in the early part of the conference, the pattern of dialogue, of conversation as inquiry into

teaching was established. I found this to be a comfortable and productive stance for my supervision.

Questioning: Questioning was a strategy in the post-conference as well as in the preconference, but its purpose and use were different. In the preconference, I questioned to assess the intern's planning and readiness to teach and learn from the lesson. In the post-conference, I questioned to probe the intern's understanding of what had contributed to the outcomes of the lesson. I wanted interns to explore the thinking that accompanied their use of strategies so they could establish guidelines for their own practice. This is a typical series of questions: What worked well in the lesson? What made it effective? What evidence do you have of its effectiveness? How did you decide to use that strategy? When would you use it again? How could you improve it? How does it relate to your teaching platform?

Asking and waiting for an explanation, restating what was said, asking for clarification, checking understanding of the applicable principles of learning, and seeking extensions to new situations helped interns to articulate what they had learned from the lesson and to fit new concepts and tentative assertions into their previous understandings of teaching/learning connections.

One of my purposes for supervision was to help interns extend their use of effective strategies. Articulating what they had done was a first step in that process. Another purpose was to develop reflective habits of mind so that they would continue to learn from experience. Over and over I said, "That is a reasonable explanation, but what else could it mean?" In using questioning as a predictable and productive part of the post-conference, I tried to instill habits of examining the effectiveness of practices as a regular part of teaching.

Keeping the questions open when one adequate answer has been found

is a habit of mind that is productive for teachers. The puzzles of practice have many solutions. Good teaching is made up of ever more exact matches between the needs of content, management, learner, and context. Teachers who develop the habit of wondering about practice will continue to improve over their careers and will be wonderful partners in collaboration wherever they teach.

Modeling effective teaching practices: In the post sequence analyses, I find examples of my own use of strategies that I recommended to the interns. At first I think this was accidental or intuitive, but once I recognized it as modeling for the intern, I used it more purposefully. For instance, in one set of observations, I noticed that I was suggesting to the interns that they question students to learn what they knew about the assignment and to extend their learning from an activity. At the same time, I was beginning to ask the intern to explain to me what s/he had learned from the conference as a way of checking my clarity and extending what they may have learned. I recognized this as a strategy that I could use in post-conferences for the first time in the late night conference with Maryellen, but it was present in earlier sequences as well. Reflecting on my strategies in the post-conference models for the interns the reflection I want them to use in reviewing their strategies.

The modeling was not always as subtle as this example suggests. In the sequence with Betsy, the third grade intern, I was more direct to ensure that she understood exactly what I meant by role playing the intended teaching strategy with her as the learner and the teacher. My notes after the conference reveal my use of modeling effective strategies. It also is a good example of testing the learner's understanding. I asked Betsy to tell me about her thinking because I wanted to be sure she understood the purposes of the strategy I wanted her to

adopt, then I had her role play with me the precise teaching moves I wanted her to try.

I decided how to model and how to use other tactics by monitoring the intern's response to my tactics. In the case of Betsy, I could tell from her response and from what I had learned about her in other interactions that she would benefit from practicing the words out loud, that merely talking about the difference would not be likely to help her use the strategy independently, so I changed my teaching tactics to ones that were more effective with her. In other cases, providing the observation data without interpretation was enough of a stimulus for the intern to develop new tactics. With the high school English intern, seeing her own pattern of interaction was enough for her to modify and improve it. Through modeling the teaching strategies I believed would be productive for the interns to use with their students, I felt that loops of learning were created that connected interns, students, and supervisors in learning about learning and teaching.

Viewing puzzles from many angles: Sometimes I used what I knew to help the interns be more effective. Other times I used my ignorance to promote their thinking. In the case of Ray and his vocabulary lesson, I was able to model quite well how students could complete his assignments without learning any vocabulary as a result. In the case of Phoebe and her rock explorations, my relative ignorance of six and seven year olds helped move the discussion of appropriate learning activities to a mutual inquiry. I was not the expert, but a learner, too. Actually, some of the ignorance was feigned since I am familiar with seven year olds, having taught second grade for four years, but nonetheless, I could genuinely join in wondering. Usually my ignorance is genuine, but after using it effectively to lead these interns to see their

instructional puzzles from the learners' perspective, I would use it again even if feigning was required.

Occasionally, the most direct path to understanding was not productive, and a different approach was tried. In the case of Maryellen and her concern over using opening experiences with kindergarten students, approaching the issue by asking what the purpose of the activity was did not lead to a solution. Later in the same post-conference, when I asked her the purposes for kindergarten, the new perspective revealed purposes that she had not been able to articulate before. She said that one purpose was to help them learn to take turns being the center of attention. Once she had identified that as a reason for having the opening routines, Maryellen was able to think of other parts of the program that served that purpose better, and she began to experiment with changing that part of the school day. Approaching the problem from a new angle helped her to see it more creatively and led to new ideas for meeting the purposes.

Finding connections between strategies and results for learners: The data collection during the observation was often for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of the lesson. I encouraged this type of feedback because I want the interns to develop the habit of judging their own success by the experiences of their students. Interns knew that they were to connect their strategies to the learners' experience and learning, but it was difficult for them to see the connections. Seeing what the students did as a result of the teacher's actions was usually not hard, but finding evidence of learning was difficult for most of them. In the case of Phoebe's rock investigations, she could articulate the connections between her teaching and the children's actions, but the connection to their learning remained unclear. That this was difficult is not

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

surprising, but learning to look for such evidence is important for the interns' continued refinement of their practices. If they were unable to do it well yet, setting the expectation that it was part of reflection and planning became my goal. I also tried to teach them what it was in practice by modeling it in my teaching of them.

In the post-conferences, I tried to model this self-assessment in my attempts to teach the interns. One way was to monitor the effects of my tactics during the teaching part of the post-conference as in the preceding example. Another way was to have the intern repeat the points of the post-conference to me. A third way was to look for evidence of reflection from the interns about the questions posed in the sequence.

Several times interns shared with me the results of plans we had made during the post observation conference that provided valuable feedback for me on the effectiveness of my supervision as well as welcome affirmation of their regard.

> "I tried the math review the way we planned and it worked! I only got to do it once because the next two days had different schedules, but I am going to remember it if I teach math next year. The kids really liked it."

> "I've been remembering to ask more questions!"

> "During the conference, you were really trying to figure out the problem with Anne and me. The questions you asked helped me see that there were many ways that I could use scientific method and I had to think about other things as well, like the children's literacy level. You were really wondering out loud and it helped me to wonder, too."

I accepted as evidence of reflection the questions and information that interns reported to me when I would see them again, often a week after the sequence. Reporting their progress seemed to me to indicate that they knew that I was sincerely interested in their learning, that I was invested in it, too, and that the puzzles I raised in

the conference were not simply exercises but indicators of genuine interest in what we could learn from their teaching experiences.

Using new understanding to plan future lessons: The final part of the post-conference usually involved planning future lessons with the increased understanding gained from the sequence. Three tactics were used most often for this goal: developing criteria for good practice and applying it to the new lesson, extending the effective strategies identified in the sequence, and addressing the missed opportunities that had been noted in the sequence.

After the intern's teaching episode had been discussed and most of the goals of the post-conference addressed, we would turn our attention to the future, the next lesson. This was a way of finding purpose for all that had gone before. Of all that had been discussed and learned, what could be used to improve the next lesson? Turning to this question was a signal to move forward to the next attempt. By this time, the direction was usually evident and the intern was ready to apply what s/he had learned to the next lesson. I tried to time the change to a future focus by checking if all of the intern's questions had been discussed and by reviewing my goals to see if the essential points had been explored.

Effective strategies that could be extended were the first source of planning. In the case of Betsy and her interaction patterns, the improvements would be made in the same context, monitoring the children's independent work. The transfer seemed fairly straight forward.

In some cases, questioning revealed that some other attempt to see what the effects of the learning activity might have been was advisable. With Phoebe and her young learners, the plan for the next lesson included planning for more data collection on the concepts that the children were forming about rocks through her unit. With Ray and his biology students, another attempt at connecting assessment to teaching was to

be attempted. When the post-conference led to a new strategy to try to solve a persistent problem, it seemed to me that the interns' efforts in reflecting and analyzing their teaching were rewarded. I hoped that this product of the sequence reinforced for them the habits of mind of self-evaluation and reflection that are part of my platform.

During this last part of the sequence, I felt it was permissible to share what I knew about teaching from my own experience and study of teaching over many years. When designing effective management of routine teaching activities was an issue in the case of Ray's vocabulary assignments or in the complex demands of the assessment of cooperative learning units, I tried to use what I knew to assist the intern. I did it by sharing, not my practices, but the criteria that I had found directed them. For example in the vocabulary planning, certain criteria for repeated assignments were used to help Ray design new formats for vocabulary lessons. As an experienced teacher, I believe that routine assignments deserve more careful attention in planning simply because they become a staple of the classroom interactions. They should serve learning, management, and personal relationship building goals. They should be effective and efficient of teacher's and learner's time.

I helped Ray by bringing this broader framing of the question to the particular problem he was confronting: even working very hard was not contributing to the students' learning biology terms. At first, I was reluctant to teach the interns my own strategies for fear that they would not fit their platforms or styles, but as I gained more experience, I felt that offering my thinking helped them to sort out the information that threatened to overwhelm them. I am confident that while they may try out my strategies at this stage, they will refine their practices by their own experience as time goes on. I think that presenting considerations and sharing experiences in general terms stimulated their thinking and did not limit their solutions to mine.

Leaving the post-conference with additional questions, affirmation of respect

and accomplishment, and a plan for new strategies to try seemed to be rewarding for the interns. In reviewing as we ended the post-conference, I tried to determine if all three of these were results for the interns and modified the closing moments to address imbalances if I sensed they were there.

Post-conference on Supervision Practice

The post-conference goals have been served for me in this parallel course of learning by the discussions and reflections that have accompanied the writing of this paper. In searching the data for effective strategies and trying to articulate the thinking that supports them, I follow the same path to knowledge that the interns traveled. Like a beginning teacher, I struggle for the words to explain the strategies I use, feeling my way by watching for evidence of their effects. My strategies are not refined. They lack the efficiency of serving many purposes at once that characterize expertise and that comes from years of reflection on practice. The level of articulation and analysis that I can bring to the strategies of teaching makes me aware of how inept are my present explanations of my supervision strategies. I know enough to know how little I know. I can only describe the phenomena; I cannot name it.

Like the interns, I depended on my enthusiasm and sincerity and on the help of others to make up for my limitations as I began to supervise. I am a learner, too. As do other learners and all learners of new areas of knowledge, I lack the words to say what my actions seem to indicate that I know. It is this effort to bring tacit knowledge to an explicit level, to construct knowledge from experience that characterizes the stage of learning that the interns and I experienced. As did the children in the rock investigations, the interns and I discovered the assistance of a more knowledgeable guide increased our learning and made it less lonely.

Post Conference Analysis

After each sequence of supervision, I reflected on the strategies I had used and whatever evidence of their effectiveness I could gather from the intern's response to them. In writing as much as I could recall of what I had done and how the intern had responded, I tried to identify effective strategies that I could use again and to find missed opportunities that I might not miss them again. This reflection led to improved practices as the practicum continued. Some of the strategies I came to rely on in the later sequences were direct results of this systematic reflection on my practice. For example, when I reflected on the effectiveness of asking Maryellen to reiterate the major points of the post-conference, I realized that making that a regular part of the post-conference would serve several purposes that I had for supervision. After that, I used it in every cycle.

Writing post conference analyses became a method of self-evaluation of my practice. I found reviewing the writing helpful as I moved from one sequence to the next. When I returned to the collected analyses as a source of data for this study, I was overwhelmed by the amount and richness of the information they provided. Analyzing them again after a year's time has increased my learning from my practicum in supervision. In trying to describe the qualities of my practice and the course my learning followed, I have returned to the analyses as data upon which to base my conclusions.

Conclusions

The purposes of the study were to articulate what I learned from practicing supervision in this context so that it can inform my future practice and to describe the learning process that led me to develop the strategies I used. Three conclusions emerge from the findings for the first purpose:

1) The same purposes can be served by many different strategies and tactics.

2) The decisions about which tactics to use are based on information gathered during the supervision sequence itself.

3) Reflection on the effectiveness of strategies increases learning from practice.

Finally, I will conclude the paper with two comments about my experience as a student of supervision. One explores the implications of being a learner of supervision among learners of teaching. The other describes the tone of joy that characterized this experience.

The purposes I had for supervision of interns did not vary, but the strategies I used to serve the purposes varied from intern to intern and from one sequence to another with the same intern. The cues for modifying the use of strategies were found within the interactions with the interns primarily during the steps of the supervision sequence itself. In some instances, things I knew about the interns from other interactions with them influenced the modifications.

For example, I knew that Betsy was likely to converse fluently without reaching or comprehending the point of the discussion. So in the post-conference, I was more purposeful than usual in setting the pattern for dealing with observation data. I also limited the number of issues that I addressed to provide a thorough discussion of the most important one. I used modeling, role playing, and directed practice to be sure she understood and was ready to transfer the new technique to the classroom situation. Betsy reported to me that she was using more questions, but to assess whether it changed her teaching would require more observation. I do think that matching her learning style with my teaching tactics offered a better chance of making a substantial and long range improvement in her teaching.

The difficulty of the model of teaching that the intern was attempting to use influenced my questioning during the preconference. If the intern was lecturing or leading a recitation, I limited my concern to provision for necessary materials, preparation, and plans for involving all students in the activity. But in the case of cooperative learning lessons, I asked many questions in addition to the standard list. The cooperative learning model is more complex than it at first appears, and interns were often unprepared to use it effectively, especially if it was unfamiliar to the students as well.

Interns' different learning styles also influenced my choice of strategies. Some needed to experiment, to try on new behaviors in order to understand them. Role playing the learner and teacher helped some interns practice new strategies in the conference to prepare to use them in the classroom. Other interns only needed to suppose the situation to understand the likely outcomes for students and plan new tactics.

The strategies that I used were adapted to the individual interns not based on some prior approximation of their needs, but on an assessment during the various steps of the sequence of what would help to make this lesson successful and to learn from it. The information I had about teaching, learning, the model being used, the intern's strengths, the students' characteristics, and the expectation of the mentor were all part of the knowledge that I brought to the sequence. The unanswered question, the wonderment identified in the preconference became the focus of data collection and the key area for inquiry during the post-conference. Despite all of the theory of teacher development that I learned and continued to ponder and my notions of what made good teaching, the choice of tactics to use with this intern during this sequence were made during the actual sequence itself.

Modifying the strategies as the supervision sequence proceeded is the same

skill required of classroom teachers. In interactions with children, teachers flex to the needs of the learner known to the teacher either from previous interactions with the child or exhibited during the lesson. Teachers develop sensitive antennae for collecting the cues they need to make the moment to moment decisions that give expert teaching its elegance and effectiveness. As a teacher, I had learned to monitor and sort a great deal of information while keeping my primary focus on the impact of the instruction on the learner's understanding. In supervision, the same skills are used to modify and individualize the supervision strategies by monitoring cues of the intern's understanding.

Like the interns, I learned from reflection on the effectiveness of my strategies. Often new tactics arose through intuitive reaction to the situation and through my perception of the intern's needs. Upon later reflection, I could identify the cues and articulate the thinking that guided my actions. I could answer the questions of the post-conference: Why did you do that? What was your thinking? When might you do that again? Making the thinking explicit through my journal reflections helped me understand my own practices and allowed me to apply the new tactics intentionally in other sequences. This cycle of supervision and learning from reflection on my experiences describes how my learning progressed. It is also a recapitulation of the purposes and strategies I used in the post-conferences with the interns. For all of us, articulating the knowledge that supported our practices increased our knowledge base for practice.

In supervising, the knowledge that supports my teaching was reorganized and brought to an explicit level in my mind. As an experienced teacher, I had a tacit knowledge base for teaching that guided my classroom practice. It was the knowing in action that meshes instructional goals with

classroom events to guide teaching as it occurs. Much of it was inarticulate. Once I began to prepare for supervision and to watch the lessons of the interns, I was able to articulate that knowledge so that it was available to me.

One day before the practicum began I watched an intern teaching practice lessons to the other interns. As I watched, I became aware of my teaching knowledge in a new way. I became aware of problems in the teaching not as formed thoughts about the intern's work but as impulses for moves I would make were I leading the discussion. Feeling what needed to be done led me to explore what the feelings indicated I might know about leading a discussion that had not previously risen above an intuitive level. I thought about this, letting what I would do float into my mind and then analyzing each move for the knowledge it implied.

One move I felt compelled to make was to clarify the facts and the opinions being expressed in the discussion of genetic engineering: What was hearsay and what was fact? This feeling indicated to me that clarifying fact and opinion was one part of leading a discussion. I wanted the intern to find out what the students knew about genetic engineering already. This made me add checking for accuracy and amount of background information as another criteria for teaching through discussion. That some people were dominating the discussion began to annoy me, so I realized that providing for equal participation was an additional criterion. As the lesson continued each of the little nudges that I felt led to an understanding of some standard that I used to monitor discussions that had been inarticulate to me before the observation. That I could do this was a powerful realization for me that kept happening over the semester. Realizing that I had a knowledge base for teaching that I could depend on as a starting point for thinking about teaching was a wonderful gift for

me. I could access what I knew when I needed it by empathizing and then reflecting on what I would do as a way of finding the considerations that surrounded teaching in different situations.

I want to emphasize that I did not use what I would do as a guide to good teaching but what I would consider as needing attention of some kind. Providing for full participation may be expressed in the classroom in many ways, but that it needs to be attended to some way is what I could glean from my own experience. After the first few instances, this thinking was much quicker and less conscious, but many times I would find myself articulating for the interns the tacit knowledge that I used in teaching.

In the supervision I provided, several bodies of knowledge interacted to direct the choice of strategies. One area was my own practice based knowledge of generic teaching skills. Another was the principles and techniques of the clinical supervision model of supervision. A third was the knowledge of particular models of instruction from the practitioner's point of view i.e., What was needed to make them work? Finally, as the experience went on, I learned the common areas of concern for the interns, what entry points to understanding the effects of their strategies were most likely to be productive for them, and indicators of their understanding.

The course my learning took is similar to the learning of the interns and of the children in the rock investigations. Articulating what we knew made tacit knowledge available for examination and application to other contexts. In all cases, the assistance of another, more knowledgeable person enhanced the opportunity to learn.

Like the interns, at first I could not discern much from the patterns of my own practice. But as time went by and I collected more data, the patterns began to emerge. I learned to state the intern's response more precisely and to find the connections

between my strategies and their experience of supervision. I made tentative assertions about my strategies based on one intern's reaction and tested those assertions in future sequences. Sometimes I discovered a strategy in my reflections, and then I realized that I had seen it or read of it before. Until I described it myself in the context of the supervision process, I had not identified it.

When I recognized it was helpful, I began asking interns to repeat the major points of the post-conference. I thought it was an example of discovering a new strategy in the process of reflecting on my practice. But, later, when I reviewed some notes I had taken for writing my platform, I found that I had noted that Goldhammer and Goldsberry espoused having the intern recite the key points of the conference as a way of ending on a positive note and of checking for understanding. Clearly, I may have remembered it on some level so that it was waiting when I was ready to use it. I don't know. Wherever it came from, it was welcome and I continued to use it. Acquiring effective strategies happens in many ways, but teachers who keep learning from their practice and who turn their discoveries into explicit understanding of learning have the potential to become more and more expert.

My status as a student of supervision and as a teacher influenced my approach to the interns. My desire to know how my supervision helped them and what improvements I could make was clear to them. I had teaching expertise to offer to them, and they had insights into my effectiveness as a supervisor to offer me. To this interdependence was added the camaraderie of being learners of new practices, teaching and supervision. We faced the same challenges: to develop our practices in the context where they were to be used, to integrate what we had studied with the realities of actual classrooms with real learners and all the complexity they present, and to confront and push back the present limitations of our understanding. Frequently, I expressed my appreciation for the opportunity to work with them and

share this year of study. Our interactions around the steps of supervision were characterized by mutual respect and curiosity.

Supervising interns in the ETEProgram was an experience of great joy for me. I loved it! From the very first sequence, I was totally engaged and enthralled with it. My journal reflections from that first day are full of expressions of joy that continued throughout the experience. Like the intern recalling the events of her teaching a week later, rereading the analyses brings the situation back to me in great detail. The setting, my mood, the silence of my dorm room, the feeling of deep engagement in thought and in working closely with the interns all return. What created this wonderful experience of learning is one of the concluding questions of the study. I would like to identify the characteristics that contributed to this feeling of joy so that I can replicate them for myself and my students.

Many elements contributed to the joy I felt. One thing was the transformation and affirmation of the knowledge that I had acquired during years of practice as a teacher. Discovering what I knew and having it almost magically available to answer questions as they were forming was a wonderful experience of discovery. The fondness I felt for the interns was certainly a factor. Teaching and learning fascinate me, and in supervision I was able to enjoy the classroom atmosphere and ponder the puzzles of practice without the work involved in teaching. It was a holiday for me. Talking about teaching is something of which I never tire. In supervision, listening to the interns explain what they were doing and helping them find the words to enter the conversation that I so much enjoy was a pleasure.

The combination of a stimulating challenge, immediate feedback on my effectiveness, discovering and expanding my own understanding, personal investment in the success of others, and the perception of my own growth were

all contributing factors. The balance between action and reflection and the unselfconsciousness of concentration were also important. But there seems to be something more. The final element, it seems to me, was putting aside my fear of failure and risking exposing the limits of my knowledge by practicing what I was learning to do. The support of other learners and the spirit of mutual inquiry into learning and teaching that characterized my experience seem to have taken away the agony and made learning to supervise a joy filled and wonderful adventure.

References

Glickman, C. (1981). Developmental supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction. Virginia: ASCD.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (chapter one).

Goldhammer, R.; Anderson, R.; Krajewski, R. (1980). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Goldsberry, L. (1988). Three functional methods of supervision, Action in Teacher Education, 10, 1-10.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teachers. Educational Leadership, 40(1), 4-10.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational Leadership, (April), 43-48.

Saphier,J. & Gower, R. (1987). The skillful teacher. Carlisle, MA: Research for Better Teaching.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1979). Supervision: Human perspectives (2nd. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1992). Supervision: Human perspectives (5th. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

The Spirit of Clinical Supervision: Learning Side by Side
Commentary on the Offering of Marianna Estabrooke

Lee Goldsberry

In the amazing Sixties, along with all the other active involvements of the era, some folks including Robert H. Anderson, Morris Cogan, and Robert Goldhammer were experimenting with preparing bright post-baccalaureate people to teach in public school classrooms. They tried to find some way to provide intense scrutiny and consideration of the teaching practices used by these neophytes so that the "trial and error" approach to developing teaching skills could be abetted by a combination of attention to detail and face-to-face discussion of teaching tactics. Clinical supervision was created to fill this need. Several years later, Richard F. Neville observed during a meeting of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS) that it was the dedicated spirit of these pioneers in clinical supervision with their passion for improving schools and learning experiences for kids that was so admirable and inspiring -- rather than the terminology (e.g., "preobservation conference," or "principle of fewness") or the five-stage or eight-phase cycle. As Neville described this spirit, his own passion for working "up close and personally -- shirt-sleeves rolled up" with teachers as they struggled with the dynamic challenges of making classrooms into joyful and productive learning laboratories bubbled throughout the room, infecting and inspiring many seasoned students of supervision (who also happened to be professors). The spirit of clinical supervision is a deliberate blend of passion and rigorous inquiry, of the joy (and, as often, frustration) of learning and the discipline of hard work, of deeply felt commitment to learners of all ages and to painstaking concentration and adaptation focused on educational improvement. Going through the motions of clinical supervision without manifesting this spirit is no more practicing clinical supervision than wiping a child's runny nose is parenting. When Cogan (1973) wrote that a university course in supervision, even one using his own text, could not prepare a clinical supervisor, he explicitly recognized the necessity of struggling with the demands of working collegially and struggling to refine one's own supervisory practices by engaging with teachers. This "learning side by side" about supervision and teaching is an indispensable part of the spirit of clinical supervision. Estabrooke (1995) gives us a rich and telling accounting of this process. What does it tell us?

Perceived spirit in Ms. Estabrooke's supervision.

From her account of her supervision three interrelated themes emerge that might characterize the spirit of her work: (1) an unambiguous and ubiquitous focus on developing the disposition of skilled self-evaluation within the interns she supervised **[purpose]**; (2) a consistent strategy for teaching skills of disciplined self-evaluation of teaching **[strategy]**; and (3) a genuine modeling of both the discipline and personal commitment for struggling to learn and improve **[passion]**.

 Copyright © 1995 by Lee Goldsberry

Purpose. Clearly, the improvement of learner achievement through refined teaching practice is a purpose for all educational supervision, and Ms. Estabrooke reports understanding that central goal. More than that, however, Ms. Estabrooke explicitly seeks to develop the disposition for self-evaluating one's teaching and adapting tactics to suit the particular context and learners faced. This dual focus with its clear emphasis on developing habits of mind as well as skilled teaching may be a defining characteristic of the spirit of clinical supervision. Witness Ms. Estabrooke's clarity:

> I intended that the supervision I provided would help the interns to improve their effectiveness as teachers by developing productive habits of mind. (p. 10)
>
> I want the interns to develop the habit of judging their own success by the experiences of their students. (p. 36)
>
> Acquiring effective strategies happens in many ways, but teachers who keep learning from their practice and who turn their discoveries into explicit understanding of learning have the potential to become more and more expert. (p. 47)
>
> I hoped that this product of the sequence reinforced for them the habits of mind of self-evaluation and reflection that are part of my platform. (p. 39)

Thus, the deliberate attempt to teach preservice teachers the skills and habits of mind for a disposition for such self-evaluation is established. Both Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) clearly shared this quest to help teachers become "withal self-directing" and "self-supervising." This intentionality toward building such a habit of mind seems to be an essential part of the spirit of clinical supervision.

Strategies. Below are a set of strategic elements of Ms. Estabrooke's practice as outlined in her own words. I have taken the liberty to label them.

> **Drawing purpose from interns** - I hoped to help them become self-monitoring by learning to make connections between their purposes for learners, the strategies they used, and evidence of their effectiveness. (p. 10)
>
> **Modeling the inquiry process** - In using questioning as a predictable and productive part of the post-conference, I tried to instill habits of examining the effectiveness of practices as a regular part of teaching. Keeping the questions open when one adequate answer has been found is a habit of mind that is productive for teachers. The puzzles of practice have many solutions. Good teaching is made up of ever more exact matches between the needs of content, management, learner, and context. Teachers who develop the habit of wondering about practice will continue to improve over their careers and will be wonderful partners in collaboration wherever they teach. (pp. 33-34)

By engaging the intern in reviewing the data in the early part of the conference, the pattern of dialogue, of conversation as inquiry into teaching was established. (p. 33)

If the interns review the questions of the preobservation conference to monitor their planning, they will be designing sound lessons with every possibility of benefits for learners. (p. 15)

I did it by sharing, not my practices, but the criteria that I had found directed them. (p. 39)

Using guiding questions - I said to her, "What is the purpose of kindergarten anyway?" She articulated about a dozen purposes for kindergarten very quickly and confidently. I asked her what I had seen in the observation she could connect for me. Then she discovered purposes for the calendar, counting, and flag salute routines. Once she had articulated them, she could see what else she might do to meet those needs and get away from some of the negative things she had mentioned. It took us a long time to get there, but this was an important insight. (p. 27)

I believe that formulating the question in her mind was all that was necessary for the intern to be productively self-evaluating in this instance. When this pattern emerges in the sequence, I feel that the intern has experienced teaching as hypothesis formation and testing, a way to continue to learn while teaching. (p. 15)

Some questions went unanswered and when I was convinced that Phoebe understood them, I was satisfied that they remained puzzles for further exploration. (p. 22)

Adapting tactics to fit the situation - The strategies that I used were adapted to the individual interns not based on some prior approximation of their needs, but on an assessment during the various steps of the sequence of what would help to make this lesson successful and to learn from it... The unanswered question, the wonderment identified in the preobservation conference became the focus of data collection and the key area for inquiry during the post-conference. Despite all of the theory of teacher development that I learned and continued to ponder and my notions of what made good teaching, the choice of tactics to use with this intern during this sequence were made during the actual sequence itself. (p. 43)

Drawing judgments from the intern - Another asked if I would try to find evidence that the learning activity was helping them to learn about fractions and not confusing them further. These requests seemed to ask for interpretation of the data. I resisted the temptation to simply provide an assessment. Instead, I collected descriptive data that we could interpret during the post-conference. (p. 17)

I did not think of analyzing the test items until faced with the bad results. In order to engage Ray in discussion I felt I needed some data to look at, so I had him help me create it. This was an attempt to get him more engaged in solving the problem... I felt at this point that I was doing all of the work to solve this problem and that he should be more active, so I asked him to generate more questions. This was slow, and it tested my ability to probe without leading the answers. (p. 24)

 Copyright © 1995 by Lee Goldsberry

Modeling self-scrutiny. One day before the practicum began I watched an intern teaching practice lessons to the other interns. As I watched, I became aware of my teaching knowledge in a new way. I became aware of problems in the teaching not as formed thoughts about the intern's work but as impulses for moves I would make were I leading the discussion. Feeling what needed to be done led me to explore what the feelings indicated I might know about leading a discussion that had not previously risen above an intuitive level. (p. 45)

Making the thinking explicit through my journal reflections helped me understand my own practices and allowed me to apply the new tactics intentionally in other sequences. (p. 44)

I question now whether I was as effective as I thought or if he was more effective in his strategies of getting help by rejecting it, a behavior I would not like my supervision to reinforce. (p. 26)

... other questions rest in the observation data, and I wonder how I selected the one I did. Perhaps another supervisor would have questioned the accuracy of the science principles demonstrated by the centers. Would that be more important? I wonder how to judge the appropriateness of the choices I made. I wonder if I attend to what I know best, language over science in selecting topics. (p. 22)

Does the set [1) Drawing purpose from interns; 2) Modeling the inquiry process; 3) Using guiding questions; 4) Adapting tactics to fit the situation; 5) Drawing judgments from the interns; and 6) Modeling self-scrutiny] seem fitting to the purpose of developing self-evaluating teachers? I think so. Moreover, the consistent theme of diligently struggling to illuminate and practice the inquiry process seems central to the spirit of clinical supervision.

Passion. No spirit seems complete without some sort of passion. Though clinical supervision has been called mechanistic and sterile, the clinical supervision captured in Ms. Estabrooke's writings is neither. Two components of her whole-hearted immersion into the spirit of clinical supervision seem to be her explicit empathy with the self-evaluating intern and her delightful joy in the collegial pursuit of meaningful learning. Again, she says it best:

Empathy - Struggling to articulate the findings and conclusions of the study provided me with a hint of how difficult it would be for interns to make sense of the data I provided for them without my help. (p. 30)

As do other learners and all learners of new areas of knowledge, I lack the words to say what my actions seem to indicate that I know. It is this effort to bring tacit knowledge to an explicit level, to construct knowledge from experience that characterizes the stage of learning that the interns and I experienced. (p. 40)

Recognizing joy - Many elements contributed to the joy I felt. One thing was the transformation and affirmation of the knowledge that I had acquired during years of practice as a teacher. Discovering what I knew and having it almost magically available to answer questions as they were forming was a wonderful experience of discovery. The fondness I felt for the interns was certainly a factor. Teaching and learning fascinate me, and in supervision I was able to enjoy the classroom atmosphere and ponder the puzzles of practice without the work involved in teaching. It was a holiday for me. Talking about teaching is something of which I never tire. In supervision, listening to the interns explain what they were doing and helping them find the words to enter the conversation that I so much enjoy was a pleasure. (p. 48)

So what? What has Ms. Estabrooke's personal account of her learning about clinical supervision taught us? I can only speak as one, admittedly biased, observer. She has provided us with anecdotal and reflective information that can help us focus and pursue our own understandings of clinical supervision. She has shared her observation and her thoughts generously so that we might compare them with our own as we struggle to learn about our own supervision. Best of all, in my mind, she has reminded us of the humanness of learning that characterizes the spirit of clinical supervision.

The final element, it seems to me, was putting aside my fear of failure and risking exposing the limits of my knowledge by practicing what I was learning to do. (p. 48)

References:

Cogan, Morris. (1973) **CLINICAL SUPERVISION.** New York: McGraw-Hill.

Estabrooke, Marianna. (1995) Learning side by side. Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Fransisco.

Goldhammer, Robert. (1969) **CLINICAL SUPERVISION: Special techniques for the supervision of teachers.** New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Neville, Richard F. (Some recent year) Comments delivered at the fall meeting of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision.